

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated April 30, 2010 has been received and reviewed. This response is directed to that action.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended, and claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the specification, and in claims 6 and 7 as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner maintained the rejections of claims 1-14, 16, 19-23 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Lykke et al. (US 6,242,405); and claims 17, 18 and 24 as obvious over Lykke in view of Gutierrez et al. (US 5,739,093). The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established against the presently claimed invention because a skilled artisan would not be motivated to modify Lykke to achieve the present invention. Moreover, Lykke actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention, which is objective evidence of nonobviousness.

Present claim 1 has been amended to require that the detergent composition comprises a gel, wherein the gel comprises polyacrylic acid as a thickening agent. Lykke fails to teach a composition where polyacrylic acid is present in a detergent gel. Lykke does teach a polyacrylic acid as a core polymer in the concentrate, but not as a

thickening agent within the detergent gel. (See col. 8, lines 13-23). Lykke's core polymer is "contained in a phase in the core which is separate from the inner liquid detergent phase". (col. 7, lines 46-47). Thus, the core polymer is not in contact with the detergent gel, as compared to the presently claimed invention. Indeed, Lykke's preference to keep the core polymer separate from the liquid detergent phase should be considered as a teaching away from the presently claimed invention, wherein the polyacrylic acid is directly contained within the liquid (gel) detergent.

With respect to the rejections of claims 17, 18 and 24 as obvious over Lykke in view of Gutierrez, the applicants respectfully submit that Gutierrez does not remedy the deficiencies of Lykke, discussed hereinabove.

The applicants believe the claims are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request such favorable action. If any issues remain, the resolution of which can be advanced through a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number listed below.

#### **CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully requests that this be considered a petition therefore. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

#### **ADDITIONAL FEE**

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account  
No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /Mark D. Marin/

Mark D. Marin – Reg. No. 50,842

Attorney for Applicants

875 Third Avenue, 8th Floor

New York, New York 10022

Tel. 212-808-0700